Crime Prediction by Data-Driven Green's Function method

Mami Kajita[1,2*] and Seiji Kajita[2]

[1] *Center for Spatial Information Science (CSIS), the University of Tokyo, 5-1-5 Kashiwanoha, Kashiwa-shi, Chiba, 277-8568, Japan*

[2] *Singular Perturbations, 3-23 Sakae-machi, Moji-ku, Kitakyusyu-shi, Fukuoka, 801-0863, Japan.*

(Dated: April 4, 2017)

arXiv:1704.00240v1 [stat.AP] 2 Apr 2017

Abstract

We present an algorithm for crime prediction based on the near-repeat victimization model solved by a Green's function scheme. The Green's function is generated from spatio-temporal correlations of a density of crime events in a historical dataset. We examine the accuracy of our method by applying it to the open data of burglaries in Chicago and New York City. We find that the cascade of the crimes has a long-time, logarithmic tail, which is consistent with an earlier study on other data of burglaries. The presented method is a powerful tool not only to predict crimes but also to analyze their correlations, because the Green's function can describe how a past crime influences the future events.

* kajita@csis.u-tokyo.ac.jp

I. INTRODUCTION

Prediction of crimes has mainly been studied by the following three methodologies. The first one is a traditional methodology developed in the fields of social psychology (Andrews and Bonta, 1994), sociological criminology, and psychopathology (Krakowski et al., 1986; Harris and Picchioni, 2013). By analyzing human aspects such as background of the criminals, their social class, and other epidemiological factors, one can obtain a set of denotative explanations on the causalities of crimes (Baskin-Sommers et al.,2013; Bonta et al., 1998; Edens, 2009; Sherman and Buerger, 1989). The second approach uses spatial information science to investigate the geographical relations of crime data. Some researchers analyze crime events by focusing on geographical information of criminals, victims, and items that prevented crimes (e.g., security cameras) (Anselin et al., 2000; Cohen and Felson, 1979; Sherman and Buerger, 1989; Tita et al., 2011). The last approach employs mathematical models to analyze crime data and extract their characteristic patterns and/or tendencies. It includes: spatio-temporal patterns of crimes modeled by a theoretical framework of pattern formations (Short et al., 2008); methods to extract crime events described by contagion processes (Mohler et al., 2011; Mohler, 2013); network models for burglary dynamics on streets (Davies, Toby, and Bishop, 2013); and a development of a precision index which is useful to evaluate a method for the crime predictions (Adepeju, Rosser, and Cheng, 2016).

According to the studies based on aforementioned methodologies, a criminal phenomenon shows a characteristic pattern in a spatio-temporal space. Specifically, some researchers revealed *near-repeat victimization* (Bernasco and Nieuwbeerta, 2005; Johnson et al., 2007; Johnson, 2008; Short et al., 2009). Namely, a crime tends to induce future crimes in its vicinity. Criminals and/or a syndicate of criminals would typically collect some information about local vulnerabilities of the targeted persons as thoroughly as possible before committing a crime. Once the information such as invasion routes, locations of security cameras, and behavioral patterns of the targets are collected, they prefer to repeat crimes in the vicinity of the first one as they can benefit from the already gained knowledge.

The near-repeat victimization can be described as a cascade of causal events which is modeled as a Self-Exciting Point Process (SEPP) (Mohler et al., 2011). The SEPP model (Daley and Vere-Jones, 2003) requires the definition of a function that quantifies the effects of an event on those that will follow. One of the ways to determine this function is Prospective

Hotspot Maps (PHM) (Bowers et al., 2004), which uses an inverse function of the elapsed time and distance from an event. The parameters of this method, however, should be tuned manually to fit the considered crime dataset. Regarding the performances of the crime prediction, non-parametric methods are usually superior to the PHM. Expectation Maximization (EM) method, which is one of the machine-learning approaches, was used in seismology to predict aftershocks by means of SEPP models without any tuning of artificial parameter (Marsan and Lengline, 2008). Inspired by this study, Mohler et al. applied the EM scheme to the crime prediction by adding a numerical extension of variable-bandwidth kernel density estimation to reduce the computational costs for treating a large amount of data (Mohler et al., 2011).

The EM scheme is a non-parametric and data-driven algorithm, that is presently considered to be the most accurate approach (Adepeju, Rosser, and Cheng, 2016). However, since crime prediction which relies on a machine-learning technique requires a large amount of data, it may happen to be ineffective for countries with low criminality rates (e.g., Japan). Given that the number of available non-parametric approaches is very limited, methods alternative to the machine-learning based schemes are urgently needed to define more robust crime-prediction tool box adapted to larger variety of situations.

In the field of materials science, a numerical technique is available to determine an unknown response function from a dataset of molecular dynamics simulations. For example, some researchers are interested in dynamical properties of surface atoms which are connected to an infinitely large number of solid atoms. With an aim to reduce the computational costs, the degrees of freedom of the solid atoms can be projected on the surface atoms by using a Green's function (Kajita, 2016). Since the Green's function is typically very difficult to derive, Cai et al. developed a scheme to reproduce a Green's function from the simulations of a finite-size system according to fluctuation dissipation theorem (Cai et al, 2000). Similarly, for the crime prediction, here we introduce the concept of the Green's function generated by a dataset and propose a data-driven approach combined with SEPP model.

This work is organized as follows. Section II reviews the SEPP model and describes our theory of the Green's function scheme. Then, we test this method by applying it to the open datasets of crime in Chicago and New York City. The performance is compared with that of the PHM and EM methods. Computational details are reported in Sec. III and results and discussions are presented in Sec. IV. Conclusions are drawn in Sec. V.

II. THEORY

Let us define observed crime rate density $\lambda(t, \mathbf{x})$ as the number of crime events per unit time and unit area at time t and position $\mathbf{x}$. This quantity is modeled as

$$\lambda(t, \mathbf{x}) = \lambda_0 + \sum_{t_i<t} g(t - t_i, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i), \tag{1}$$

where λ_0 is a uniform background term and $g(t - t_i, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i)$ corresponds to the causal effect induced by the past i-th event that occurred at $(t_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$. In this expression, we assume that the causal term depends only on time and spatial differences between $(t, \mathbf{x})$ and $(t_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$. Equation (1) describes the SEPP model (Marsan and Lengline, 2008; Marsan and Lengline, 2010) that captures the near-repeat victimization, and thus, is able to predict crime events (Mohler et al., 2011).

Once Eq. (1) is obtained, we must design $g(t, \mathbf{x})$. Inspired by a technique of molecular dynamics simulations in materials science (Cai et al, 2000; Kajita, 2016), here we introduce a new method to determine $g(t, \mathbf{x})$. Let us define a density field of the crime events per unit time and unit area as

$$\rho(t, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_i \delta(t - t_i)\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i). \tag{2}$$

Using Eq. (2), the second term of Eq. (1) can be expressed as

$$\sum_{t_i<t} g(t - t_i, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i) = \int_0^t dt' \int d\mathbf{x}' g\left(t - t', \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\right) \rho(t', \mathbf{x}'). \tag{3}$$

Assuming that crime events happen as a result of the near-repeat victimization, there should be a causal relationship between the first event and the successive ones. We consider a law of causality – which governs the density field $\rho(t, \mathbf{x})$ – described by a partial differential equation. On the basis of this hypothesis, here we construct a Green's function scheme by taking into account the similarity of Eq. (1) to a solution of the partial differential equation.

Actually, the right term of Eq. (3) can be treated as a special solution of the partial differential equation if we consider g as a Green's function (Stanley, 1982). Furthermore, by regarding the crime rate density $\lambda(t, \mathbf{x})$ in SEPP model of Eq. 1 as equal to the density field $\rho(t, \mathbf{x})$ defined in the deterministic partial differential equation, the solution $\rho(t, \mathbf{x})$ satisfies

$$\rho(t, \mathbf{x}) = \int_0^t dt' \int d\mathbf{x}' g\left(t - t', \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\right) \rho(t', \mathbf{x}') + \int d\mathbf{x}' g(t, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')\rho(t = 0, \mathbf{x}'). \tag{4}$$

The second term of Eq. (4) is a term for the general solution required for the initial condition at $t = 0$. A boundary condition $\rho(t, |\mathbf{x}| \to \infty) = 0$ is set.

By performing Fourier and Laplace transformations, Eq. (4) can be divided into independent equations for each wave-number vector $\mathbf{k}$,

$$\rho(z, \mathbf{k}) = g\,(z, \mathbf{k})\,\rho(z, \mathbf{k}) + g(z, \mathbf{k})\rho(t = 0, \mathbf{k}). \tag{5}$$

Equation (5) can be solved as

$$\rho(z, \mathbf{k}) = \Phi(z, \mathbf{k})\rho(t = 0, \mathbf{k}), \tag{6}$$

where

$$\Phi(z, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{g(z, \mathbf{k})}{1 - g(z, \mathbf{k})}. \tag{7}$$

The Laplace inverse transformation of Eq. (6) leads to

$$\Phi(t, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{\rho(t, \mathbf{k})}{\rho(t = 0, \mathbf{k})}. \tag{8}$$

The function $\Phi(t, \mathbf{k})$ is a time development operator for the density field of crime events and is a function of time difference t. We determine $\Phi(t, \mathbf{k})$ by means of the statistical average of the whole dataset with respect to pairs of the density fields with the time difference t.

$$\Phi(t, \mathbf{k}) = \left\langle \frac{\rho(t + t_0, \mathbf{k})}{\rho(t_0, \mathbf{k})} \right\rangle_{t_0}, \tag{9}$$

where t_0 is the initial time for each sample in the statistical average. Then, $g(z, \mathbf{k})$ can be calculated by the Laplace transformation of $\Phi(t, \mathbf{k})$ through Eq. (7). Finally, we obtain $g(t, \mathbf{x})$ by the Fourier and Laplace inverse transformations of $g(z, \mathbf{k})$. In the following, we call this method Data-Driven Green's Function (DDGF) method.

III. CALCULATION DETAILS

The algorithm presented in Sec. II is examined by applying it to two datasets of burglaries in Chicago and New York City. For this test, we created rectangular meshes on a defined area along the horizontal and vertical axes with an interval of Δx. The time axis is divided by Δt. The density field is calculated by $\rho(t, \mathbf{x}) \sim \sum_{i \in A} \delta_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i} \delta_{t, t_i} / (\Delta x^2 \Delta t)$, where a subset A consists of the events in the rectangular mesh for $\mathbf{x}$ and $|t - t_i| < \Delta t$. For the mesh parameters, $\Delta x = 0.25$ km and $\Delta t = 1$ day are used.

Note that, if one uses Eq. (9) directly for the purpose of the crime prediction, a numerical instability may arise when the denominator $\rho(t_0, \mathbf{k})$ takes a very small value. If multiple events are observed simultaneously at time t_0, their interferences of the Fourier components at a $\mathbf{k}$ point would deaden the intensity of $\rho(t_0, \mathbf{k})$. In reality, however, the events which seem to have occurred in the same time region $|t_0 - t_i| < \Delta t$ do not happen exactly simultaneously. Namely, the interference of the multiple events due to assigning the Δt mesh is a mathematical artifact, and thus, the multiple events should be treated individually. Based on this argument, the instability can be fixed by a decomposition of the density field into individual crime as

$$\Phi(t, \mathbf{k}) = \left\langle \sum_{j}^{N_{t_0}} \frac{\rho(t + t_0, \mathbf{k})}{\rho_j(t_0, \mathbf{k})} \right\rangle_{t_0}, \tag{10}$$

where $\rho_j(t_0, \mathbf{k})$ is the individual j-th event that satisfies $\rho(t_0, \mathbf{k}) = \sum_j^{N_{t_0}} \rho_j(t_0, \mathbf{k})$, and N_{t_0} is the number of crimes at t_0.

Below, we describe the actual steps for the DDGF algorithm used in our test.

Step 1: After calculating the density field $\rho(t, \mathbf{x})$ from the past data, discrete Fourier transformation is performed to obtain $\rho(t, \mathbf{k})$.

Step 2: $\Phi(z, \mathbf{k})$ is calculated by the Laplace transformation of the numerical solution of Eq. (10).

Step 3: The Cartesian coordinates (k_x, k_y) are converted into polar coordinates (k_r, k_θ). Then, $\Phi(z, k_r, k_\theta)$ is averaged over the angle k_θ as: $\Phi(z, k_r) = \langle \Phi(z, k_r, k_\theta) \rangle_{k_\theta}$.

Step 4: The $g(t, r)$ is calculated by Laplace inverse transformation and Hankel transformation of $g(z, k_r) = \Phi(z, k_r)/(\Phi(z, k_r) + 1)$.

Step 5: The density of the predicted crimes is obtained as: $\lambda(t, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{t_i < t} g(t - t_i, |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i|)$.

We used the open datasets of burglaries in Chicago in 2011 and New York City in 2013 (City of Chicago Data Portal; NYC OpenData). After choosing a spot as the center of a circle in the south area of Chicago and in Brooklyn area, we extracted the crime data within 6 km from these centers for the period of 300 days . The numbers of the data for Chicago and New York City are about 6000 and 3000, respectively.

The performance of the DDGF method is evaluated by comparing it with other two representative methods: the EM and PHM schemes. We employ the simplest type of the EM algorithm developed in Ref. (Marsan and Lengline, 2008). The $g(t, r)$ in the PHM method was proposed as follows (Bowers et al., 2004):

$$g(t, r) = \frac{1}{(1 + t/7\Delta t)(1 + 2r/\Delta x)}, \tag{11}$$

together with the cutoff condition $g(t, r) = 0.0$ when $t > 60$ or $r > 0.4$ km. The above form and parameters were optimized *a priori* so that they could predict well the burglaries (Bowers et al., 2004).

In order to evaluate the accuracy of our method, we use the same index proposed in Refs. (Mohler et al., 2011). Some of the defined meshes are selected in order of higher value of $\lambda(t, \mathbf{x})$ up to a certain ratio of the whole area. The selected area is checked if the crimes that happened at t are predicted correctly. As the index of the accuracy, we employ the number of correctly-predicted crimes divided by total number of crimes.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Figure 1 shows the percentage of the predicted crimes as a function of the area selected in Chicago and New York City. For example, at 20% of the area selected, the DDGF, EM, and PHM methods successfully predicted 47%, 43%, and 41% of the crimes happened in Chicago, respectively, while those are 41%, 38%, and 36% in New York City. For the case of Chicago, the results from DDGF method shows the best accuracy over the whole range. For the case of New York City, DDGF method exhibits better performance only in the higher percentage region of the area selected and overall accuracies of DDGF and EM are comparable. These results promise that the DDGF method possesses an excellent potential in predicting crimes.

With an aim to evaluate the qualitative differences among DDGF, EM, and PHM methods, we recalculated $g(t, r = 0)$ more accurately using more data in Chicago: the period of 450 days and 9000 events in total. As shown in the inset of Fig. 2, the results from DDGF and EM methods exhibit distinctive peaks while that of PHM method decays monotonically. This means that, according to DDGF and EM methods, the recidivism is likely to occur after certain days. Actually, the two methods give very similar short-time-scale



FIG. 1. Accuracies of the crime predictions tested by the DDGF, EM, and PHM methods for the data of burglaries in Chicago (a) and New York City (b). The percentage of crimes predicted were calculated by averaging over 50 samples.

behaviors: 1, 5, and 9 days after the first event for DDGF method while 1, 6, and 9 days for EM method. The most prominent feature of the DDGF method can be found in the long-time-scale behavior of $g(t, r = 0)$. As the Fig. 2 shows, $g(t, r = 0)$ produced by the DDGF method decays only slowly. This behavior is very different from those of the EM and PHM methods in which $g(t, r = 0)$ shows a rapid decay. What is particularly interesting is that the decay obtained by DDGF method is well-fitted by a logarithmic function: namely, the $g(t, r = 0)$ has a long-time tail.

Finally, we compare our results with those of the earlier studies. To shed light on the near-repeat victimization, some researchers collected cases of burglary that happend in the same location and analyzed the time intervals between the events (Anderson, Chenery and Pease, 1995; Burquest et al., 1992; Ratcliffe and Mccullagh 1998). In particular, Ratcliffe et al. studied the data of all kinds of burglaries occurred in Nottinghamshire in UK for the period of 1995 – 1997 (Ratcliffe and Mccullagh 1998). They found that the long-time-scale behavior of the observed distribution function can be fitted with $-\log(t)$, as observed by the DDGF method. Since the data used in the present study contains all types of burglaries, our condition is similar to that of the Ratcliffe's work. Thus, we consider the logarithmic-like tail obtained by the DDGF method is reasonable.



FIG. 2. $g(t, r = 0)$ obtained by the DDGF, EM, and PHM methods. Concerning the result from DDGF method, its long-time-scale feature is fitted by a logarithmic function of $-a \log(bt)$, where a and b are fitting parameters; and the logarithmic line is overlaid as well. (inset) The short-time-scale behavior of $g(t, r = 0)$.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the Self-Exciting Point Process model for the near-repeat victimization, we developed a crime-prediction algorithm using a Green's function that describes the cascade of criminal events. The presented method – Data-Driven Green's Function (DDGF) method – was applied to the open datasets of Chicago and New York City and compared with other two representative methods: Expectation Maximization (EM) method and Prospective Hotspot Maps (PHM) method. DDGF method exhibited excellent performance – superior to or comparable to EM and PHM methods. In addition, the DDGF method provided us with a time correlation of the crimes: an oscillating feature in the short-time range and a characteristic long-time correlation that is well-fitted with a logarithmic function. This long-

time-scale feature, in fact, was observed in an earlier study on the near-repeat victimization (Ratcliffe and Mccullagh 1998). Namely, the DDGF method is not only able to predict crimes, but also offer a novel index that enables us to mine the buried causal effects of crime events, and this implies a crucial insight in criminology.

Recently, the classical "know-how"-based policing is increasingly being replaced and/or supported by a predictive policing all over the world. For example, Mohler et al., who proposed the crime-prediction algorithm based on the EM method, launched a start-up company which aims at designing of efficient patrol routes. Their applications have been so far installed in police offices in several countries, and their method has contributed in decreasing the number of crimes (PredPol). We believe that the DDGF method can also contribute to the society by offering a novel tool to reach a higher level of security.

REFERENCES

Adepeju, Monsuru, Gabriel Rosser, Tao Cheng. 2016. Novel evaluation metrics for sparse spatio-temporal point process hotspot predictions - a crime case study. International Journal of Geographical Information Science 1362-3087.

Anderson D., S. Chenery and K. Pease. 1995. Biting back: Tackling repeat burglary and car crime. Police Research Group: Crime Detection and Prevention Series, Paper 58: 1-57.

Andrews D. A. and Bonta J. 1994. The psychology of criminal conduct. Cliincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Anselin, Luc, Jacqueline Cohen, David Cook, Wilpen Gorr, and George Tita. 2000. Spatial Analyses of Crime. Criminal Justice, Measurement and analysis of crime and justice. vol.4.

Baskin-Sommers, Arielle R., Deborah R. Baskin, Ira B. Sommers and Joseph P. Newman. 2013. The Intersectionality of Sex, Race, and Psychopathology in Predicting Violent Crimes. Criminal Justice and Behavior 40: 1068.

Bernasco, W., and Nieuwbeerta, P. 2005. How Do Residential Burglars Select Target Areas? A New Approach to the Analysis of Criminal Location Choice. The British Journal of Criminology, 45:296-315. [100,104].

Bonta, James, Moira Law, and Karl Hanson. 1998. The prediction of criminal and violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders: a meta-analysis. Psychological bulletin 2: 123-142.

Bowers, Kate J., Shane D. Johnson, and Ken Pease. 2004. Prospective hot-spotting the future of crime mapping? British Journal of Criminology 44.5: 641-658.

Burquest, Ralph, Graham Farrell, and Ken Pease. 1992. Lessons from schools. Policing 8.2: 148-155.

Cai, Wei, Maurice de Koning, Vasily V. Bulatov, and Sidney Yip. 2000. Minimizing boundary reflections in coupled-domain simulations. Physical Review Letters 85.15: 3213.

City of Chicago Data Portal, Crimes, `https://data.cityofchicago.org/Public-Safety/Crimes-2001-`

Cohen, L. E. and M. Felson M. 1979. Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. Am Sociol Rev 44:588-608.

Davies, Toby P and Steven R Bishop. 2013. Modelling patterns of burglary on street networks. Crime Science 2:10.

Edens, John F. 2009. Interpersonal Characteristics of Male Criminal Offenders: Personality, Psychopathological, and Behavioral Correlates. Psychological Assessment 21.1: 89-98.

Harris, Stephanie T., Marco M. Picchioni. 2013. A review of the role of empathy in violence risk in mental disorders. Aggression and Violent Behavior 18:335-342.

Johnson, S. D., Bernasco, W., Bowers, K. J., Elffers, H., Ratcliffe, J., Rengert, G., and Townsley, M. 2007. Space-Time Patterns of Risk: A Cross National Assessment of Residential Burglary Victimization. Journal of Quantitative Criminology 23:201-219. [100]

Johnson, S. D. 2008. Repeat Burglary Victimisation: A Tale of Two Theories. Journal of Experimental Criminology 4:215-240. [100,103,105]

Kajita, Seiji. 2016. Green's function nonequilibrium molecular dynamics method for solid surfaces and interfaces. Physical Review E 94.3: 033301.

Krakowski, Menachem, Jan Volavkaa, David Brizera. 1986. Psychopathology and violence: A review of literature. Comprehensive Psychiatry 27, 2:131-148.

Marsan, David and Olivier Lengline. 2008. Extending earthquakes' reach through cascading. Science 319.5866: 1076-1079.

Marsan, David and Olivier Lengline. 2010. A new estimation of the decay of aftershock density with distance to the mainshock, Journal of Geophysical Research 115:B09302.

Mohler, G. O., Short, M. B., Brantingham, P. J., Schoenberg, F. P., and Tita, G. E. 2011. Self-exciting point process modeling of crime. J Am Stat Assoc 106, 493, 100-108.

Mohler, George O. 2013. Modeling and estimation of multi-source clustering in crime and security data. The Annals of Applied Statistics 7, 3:1525-1539.

NYC OpenData, Historical New York City Crime Data, `https://data.cityofnewyork.us/Public-Safet`

PredPol. `http://www.predpol.com/`

Daley, D., and Vere-Jones, D. 2003. An Introduction to the Theory of Point Processes (2nd ed.), New York: Springer. [100,101]

Ratcliffe, J. H. and M. J. Mccullagh. 1998. Identifying repeat victimization with gis. Brit. J. Criminol. 38, 4:651.

Sherman, Lawrence William and Michael E. Buerger. 1989. Hot spots of predatory crime : routine activitices and the criminology of place. Criminology 27,1:27.

Short, Martin B., Maria R. D'orsogna, Virginia B. Pasour, George E. Tita, P. Jeffrey Brantingham, Andrea L. Bertozzi, Lincoln B. Chayes. 2008. A statistical model of criminal behavior. Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences 18, Suppl:1249-1267.

Short, M. B., M. R. DOrsogna, P. J. Brantingham, G. E. Tita. 2009. Measuring and Modeling Repeat and Near-Repeat Burglary Effects, J Quant Criminol. DOI 10.1007/s10940-009-9068-8.

Stanley J. Farlow. 1982. Partial Differential Equations for Scientists and Engineers. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Tita, George E., Steven M. Radil, 2011. Spatializing the Social Networks of Gangs to Explore Patterns of Violence. J Quant Criminol 27:521-545.